

REMARKS

Claims 5 and 7-13 are now pending in the application. By this amendment, Claims 5 and 7 have been amended and Claims 1-4 and 6 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The basis for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gaynes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,165,885).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 5 calls for a wiring board production method including placing a mask on a substrate of a flexible printed circuit to expose each of a plurality of substrate terminals on the substrate through a corresponding opening in the mask, whereby each opening in the mask is larger than the corresponding substrate terminal. See Specification at pg. 16, Paragraph [0078] and FIG. 3. In addition, independent Claim 5 calls for applying solder through the openings in the mask to each of the plurality of substrate terminals, mounting an IC package preformed with terminals on the substrate so that the terminals of the IC package are aligned with corresponding

substrate terminals through the solder, and for melting the solder in a reflow process after mounting the IC package. See Specification at pg. 16, Paragraph [0078], pg. 18, Paragraph [0082-0084], and FIGS. 3 and 5.

Gaynes teaches a method of forming solder balls onto an IC. See Gaynes at Col. 7, Ins. 54-67 and Col. 8, Ins. 1-2. Gaynes fails to teach mounting an IC package on a substrate such that terminals of the IC package are aligned with corresponding substrate terminals through solder. In this manner, Gaynes also fails to teach performing a reflow process after mounting the IC package. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Gaynes fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Gaynes fails to teach mounting an IC package on a substrate, and further, because Gaynes fails to teach performing a reflow process after mounting an IC package, Applicant respectfully submits that Gaynes fails to teach each and every element of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 5, as well as Claims 7-13, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Grigg (U.S. Pat. No. 6,622,380).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Grigg teaches applying a solder mask layer (30) to a substrate (6) of a microelectronic die (ie, an IC package (10)), whereby the solder mask layer electrically isolates traces (22) and ball pads (2) from each other. See Grigg at Col. 4, Ins. 30-38,

Col. 4, Ins. 36-38, and FIG. 2. In this manner, Grigg fails to teach placing a mask on a substrate of a flexible printed circuit board or applying solder through openings of a mask. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Griggs fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Grigg fails to teach placing a mask on a substrate of a flexible printed circuit board, and further, because Grigg fails to teach applying solder through openings of a mask, Applicant respectfully submits that Grigg fails to teach each and every element of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 5, as well as Claims 7-9, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grigg (U.S. Pat. No. 6,622,380) in view of Ishibashi (U.S. Pat. No. 5,931,577).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 5 is believed to be in condition for allowance in light of the remarks contained above. Because Claims 10-13 depend from independent Claim 5, dependant Claims 10-13 should similarly be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec. 23, 2004

By:



G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/MHS